	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/450,680	MARUMO, MITSUJI
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Steven H. Rao	2814

All Participants:

(1) _Steven H. Rao_.

(2) _Jack S. Cubert (24,245)_.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: _24 January 2006_

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☐ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☒ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, 103, etc.)

Claims discussed:

_22-33,41-52_

Prior art documents discussed:

AAPR, Drake and Akagawa

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

_____ (1/24/2006)   _____

(Examiner/SPE Signature)   (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner provided Mr. Cubert with a copy of the CAFC decision in IPXLv Amazon (77 USPQ2d 1140) and showed how the numerous functional language in the pending claims are not proper and force the Examiner to issue an 112(2) indefinite rejection, to avoid the 112(2) rejection the examiner suggested detailed claim language. Further present claims 41-52 are not allowable unless amended to include language similar to claim 22 and conditions under which the presently applied prior art allegedly may not work Mr. Cubert will contact his clients and get back by Jan. 31, 2005, If no reply is received by Jan. 31, 205 the Examiner will be forced to issue an action based on current submissions till that date. .